Freedom through marketing is not double speak

HASEEB, Shabbir, HYMAN, Michael, DEAN, Dianne and DAHL, Stephan

Journal of Business Ethics

'Freedom through Marketing' is not Doublespeak

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Article Type:	Original Paper
Full Title:	'Freedom through Marketing' is not Doublespeak
Section/Category:	Others
Keywords:	Anti-slavery campaigns; mystification; ethical blindness
Corresponding Author:	Michael R Hyman, Ph.D. New Mexico State University Las Cruces, NM UNITED STATES
Corresponding Author E-Mail:	mhyman@nmsu.edu
Order of Authors:	Haseeb Shabbir, Ph.D.
	Michael R Hyman, Ph.D.
	Dianne Dean, Ph.D.
	Stephan Dahl, Ph.D.
Funding Information:	
Abstract:	The articles comprising this thematic symposium suggest options for exploring the nexus between freedom and unfreedom, as exemplified by the British abolitionists' anti-slavery campaign and the paradox of freedom. Each article has implications for how these abolitionists achieved their goals, social activists' efforts to secure reparations for slave ancestors, and modern slavery (e.g., human trafficking). We present the abolitionists' undertaking as a marketing campaign, highlighting the role of instilling moral agency and indignation through re-humanizing the dehumanized. Despite this campaign's eventual success, its post-emancipation phase illustrates a paradox of freedom. After introducing mystification as an explanation for the obscuring rhetoric used to conceal post-emancipation violations of freedom during the West's colonial phase, we briefly discuss the appropriateness of reparations. Finally, we discuss the contributions made by the articles in this thematic symposium.
Suggested Reviewers:	
Additional Information:	

Question	Response
1. Is the manuscript submitted elsewhere?	No
2. Has the work reported in this manuscript been reported in a manuscript previously rejected by the Journal of Business Ethics?	No

Title Page (containing all authors contact details)

‘Freedom through Marketing’ is not Doublespeak

Running Title: Freedom through Marketing

Haseeb Shabbir
Senior Lecturer in Marketing
Hull University Business School
University of Hull, UK
Hull, HU6 7RX
Phone: +44 (0)1482 463197
Fax +44(0)1482 466511
Email: h.shabbir@hull.ac.uk

Michael R. Hyman
Distinguished Achievement Professor of Marketing
New Mexico State University
College of Business, Box 30001, Dept. 5280
Las Cruces NM 88003-8001 USA
Phone: (505) 646-5238
Fax: (505) 646-1498
Email: mhyman@nmsu.edu

Dianne Dean
Reader in Marketing
Sheffield Hallam University, UK
Sheffield S1 1WB
Email: d.m.dean@shu.ac.uk

Stephan Dahl
Adjunct Professor of Marketing
James Cook University
Townsville Campus, 4811 Townsville
Queensland, Australia
Phone: +351 919 998 582
Email: Stephan.dahl@jcu.edu.au

‘Freedom through Marketing’ is not Doublespeak

Abstract

The articles comprising this thematic symposium suggest options for exploring the nexus between freedom and unfreedom, as exemplified by the British abolitionists’ anti-slavery campaign and the paradox of freedom. Each article has implications for how these abolitionists achieved their goals, social activists’ efforts to secure reparations for slave ancestors, and modern slavery (e.g., human trafficking). We present the abolitionists’ undertaking as a marketing campaign, highlighting the role of instilling moral agency and indignation through re-humanizing the dehumanized. Despite this campaign’s eventual success, its post-emancipation phase illustrates a paradox of freedom. After introducing mystification as an explanation for the obscuring rhetoric used to conceal post-emancipation violations of freedom during the West’s colonial phase, we briefly discuss the appropriateness of reparations. Finally, we discuss the contributions made by the articles in this thematic symposium.

Keywords: Paradox of freedom, anti-slavery campaigns, abolition, transatlantic slave trade, reparations, mystification, ethical blindness, human trafficking

Compliance with Ethical Standards: No ethical standards were violated nor conflicts of interest created in the production of this manuscript.

Prologue

Following the 50th Academy of Marketing conference on freedom through marketing, a symposium was convened to explore how freedom through marketing and ethics intersect. Given its anti-slavery—and thus freedom—connection, partly because famous son William Wilberforce helped spearhead Britain's abolition movement (Hague, 2008; Metaxas, 2009; Oldfield, 2007), the University of Hull was an ideal venue for the conference and symposium.[i] To sustain the university's commitment to exploring the freedom-slavery nexus, symposium organizers queried attendees about the relationship between freedom and marketing. This thematic symposium for *Journal of Business Ethics* reflects that relationship.

Our introductory article presents historical lessons about counter-marketing in markets characterized by inequality, injustice, and oppression. We proceed as follows. After introducing quantitative and qualitative freedom, we discuss British abolitionists' use of counter-marketing to convince Britons to spurn slavery[ii]. Because post-abolitionist colonial occupation compromised the abolitionists' original counter-marketing efforts, we next question the promulgation of revisionist historical accounts that are consistent with social mystification and designed to justified humanitarian imperialism by mythologizing Britain's abolishment of slavery (Forclaz, 2015). Then, we briefly explore the appropriateness of reparations for ancestors—analogous to legal remedies to compensate consumers for injuries caused by product use—harmed by the slave trade's legacy (Beckles, 2013; Feagin, 2004; Streich, 2002; Valls, 1999). Finally, we preview this thematic symposium's five articles and relate them to the British abolitionists' anti-slavery movement and freedom from injustice, inequality, and oppression for modern slaves (e.g., human trafficking). Ignoring parallels between the slave trade's legacy and modern slavery is tantamount to protecting humanity from "understanding that, like the

consumers of the past, we are dependent on the abhorrent exploitation of others" (Bravo, 2007, p.295).

Quantitative versus Qualitative Freedom

Given its ambiguous, value-laden, and contested nature, freedom is ethereal and problematic because it camouflages differing connotations (Foner, 1994; Gray, 1991; Taylor, 2004). Freedom's "complex historical deposit" (Williams, 2001, p.4) has limited its unified conceptualization and subjected it to semantic and ontological snags (Schut and Grassiani, 2017). Although other schemes exist for categorizing freedom (e.g., negative versus positive (Berlin, 1988; Fromm, 1941), formal versus substantive (Sen, 1999)), the quantitative versus qualitative scheme is the most parsimonious (Dierksmeier and Pirson, 2010).

Quantitative freedom depreciates the "intrinsic values of culture, gender differences, traditional life forms and their respective specificities, making invisible the very contexts out of which real freedom and autonomy grow" (Dierksmeier and Pirson, 2010, p.10). Its maxim 'the more, the better' and its dictum 'homo economicus' instrumentalizes people by ignoring their inalienable rights (Pirson, 2017; Sen, 1999). For example, quantitative freedom's effect on gender inequality are artifacts of macroeconomic policy's three gender biases: male breadwinner bias (i.e., perpetuating women's financial dependence on men), commodification bias (i.e., ignoring women's income-in-kind), and deflationary bias (i.e., slashing social service expenditures) (Gasper and Staveren, 2003; Sen, 1999). Our later discussion about implications for Britain's abolitionist and post-emancipation stories reflect a rupture in quantitative freedom (i.e., transition from the abolitionist's qualitative freedom to post-emancipatory quantitative neo-liberalism).

In contrast, qualitative freedom espouses self-reflective and self-constraining liberty, thus prioritizing people's self-actualization as social agents (Dierksmeier and Pirson, 2010). Its maxim 'the better, the more' reflects a universalistic principle: people are social beings. Given the importance of social self-identity, qualitative freedom "circumscribes to the realm of both individual and societal liberties so that all can live in dignity and freedom" (Dierksmeier and Pirson, 2010, p.15). By prioritizing human essence, qualitative freedom assumes each "person…[is] a moral entity….worthy of performing moral acts and receiving moral acts" (Waytz et al., 2014, p.61).

Substantive freedom, which is the capacity to achieve valued ends by 'being and doing', reifies the qualitative approach by relying on capacity rather than external influence (Sen, 1999). Qualitative freedom ensures equality and tolerance, with examples often extending from non-Western perspectives that espouse freedom as social responsibility; hence, "Western traditions are not the only ones that prepare us for a freedom based approach to social understanding" (Sen, 1999, p.249).

Humanistic marketing, which conforms to a qualitative approach to freedom characterized as "morally grounded, participative and relationally oriented" (Dierksmeier and Pirson, 2010, p.20), dignifies rather than commodifies consumers (Varey and Pirsons, 2014) (i.e., treats them "as whole human beings with minds, hearts, and spirits") (Kotler et al., 2010, p.4). Humanistic marketing considers consumers' extended well-being and creates exchanges that enhance their lives and unleash their creativity (Varey and Pirson, 2014).

Freedom-related Values

Although scholars may view economic development as the means and end of freedom (Sen, 1999), this perspective ignores freedom's cluster of interrelated values (Gasper and

Staveren, 2003; Nussbaum, 1995). Consequently, the importance of values related to freedom—such as caring, empathy, self-esteem, friendship, respect, and justice—is obfuscated. In contrast, a 'capabilities approach' highlights unfreedoms (e.g., women face lower education levels, reproductive health risks, and labor market discrimination), as all "capabilities that human beings could acquire are to be understood as freedoms" (Gasper and Staveren, 2003, p.9). This approach also demands greater attention to internal powers and external opportunities because capabilities often require nurturing to flourish (Crocker, 1999). Because freedom, justice, and caring are interconnected yet distinct, freedom should encapsulate these values, as attaining it at a personal agency level ultimately requires social justice (Staveren, 2001). Thus, any exploration of freedom through marketing should consider violations of inequality, injustice, and oppression.

Slavery and the Paradox of Freedom

The genocidal components of Western colonial history are well-documented (Beckles, 2013; Davis, 2001; Hochschild; 1999; Jones, 2011; Leach et al., 2013; Stannard, 1992). Recognizing these components exposes the sociopathological norms that Wilberforce, his contemporaries, and slaves faced. "The colonizers had the *intent to destroy, in whole, or in part* ethnic, 'racial', and religious groups that complicated the colonial project" (Leach et al., 2013, p.36). Estimates of Blacks killed by the transatlantic slave trade range from four million (Lovejoy, 1989; Rogozinki, 2000) to 60 million (Sherwood, 2012; Stannard, 1992).

The debate about freedom's evolution "has bruited in the open what we cannot stand to hear," namely that its construction is intertwined with the West's historical relationship with slavery, as evinced by the "grandeur and horrors of industrial Europe and America" (Patterson, 1991, pp.402-403). Although slavery is the underside of freedom, the slavery-freedom dyad has long resisted political and social consensus (Engerman, 2003). Compounding the complex

historical trajectory of Western freedom was the parallel between enslaving the 'other' and self-slavery to create "passive subjects over whom monarchs claimed divinely sanctioned absolute rule" (Smallwood, 2014, p.111). Emancipation from self-slavery decentralized the personal liberty of white men, who became the "the freest individuals the Western world had ever known" (Appleby 1992, p.155) by institutionalizing slavery (Berlin, 1998; Blackburn, 1988; Davis, 1975).

Richard Price, a friend of Thomas Jefferson, noted the incongruence between a "people who have been struggling so earnestly to save themselves from slavery" and their readiness to enslave others (Boyd, 1953, p.259). Explaining Western 'expansion of freedom' and "assigning responsibility for the positive transformations of freedom" (Smallwood, 2014, p.113) makes freedom problematic (Wahab and Jones, 2011). The post-emancipation political and social acceptability of colonialism, or "liberalism's contentious reformulations beyond abolition," reveal the paradox of "blurring the boundaries between slavery and abolition and the equation of the latter with freedom" by questioning the "seemingly tidy and unproblematic relationship between unfreedom and freedom" (Wahab and Jones, 2011, p.4). The British abolitionists' legacy suggests that oppression, inequality, and injustice haunt freedom (Grant, 2013; Parijs, 1997; Sen, 1999), yet attaining freedom for silenced or marginalized persons means recognizing it is bound by moral responsibility and respect for human dignity (Pirson, 2017).

Modern management, built on capitalism and free markets, is rooted in slavery (Rosenthal, 2018); for example, the transatlantic slave trade contributed substantially to British and U.S. economic development (Beckert and Rockman, 2016; Draper, 2009; Hall et al., 2014; Inikori, 1987; Johnson, 2010; Mintz, 1986). As "one of the most ambitious experiments in social engineering of the early modern era: the establishment of slave plantations" (Osterhammel and

Petersson, 2005, p.47), the commodification of slaves was instrumental in re-structuring Western economies (Black, 2015). Providing new consumer goods to "stimulate the body, mind and senses: sugar, tobacco, caffeine…coffee and chocolate" slavery's profitability relied on substantially altering the Western consumers' palate (Black, 2015, p.40).

Abolitionists' Campaign

Because "for the abolitionists, freedom was the avowed central issue in the debate over slavery" (Drescher, 1997, p.135), their society-transforming efforts comprised a prototypical campaign for freedom through marketing. Their campaign, which refuted dehumanizing Blacks as sub-human apes, vile brutes, or three-fifths of a person (in the antebellum U.S.), involved mass media and emotive appeals (Drescher, 1997, 2009; Haslam et al., 2013; Hastings, 2017; Smith, 2012; Woods, 2015). Ultimately, benevolent appeals meant to arouse compassion and sympathy for slaves and retributive appeals meant to rebuke slave traders spurred Britons into action (Woods, 2015).

Their campaign serves as an exemplar for social marketing (Hastings, 2017), social and human rights movements (Drescher, 1997; Smith, 2012), boycotting (Irving et al., 2002), and the evolution of public relations (Kotler and Mindak, 1978). The abolitionists invented and used many of the techniques we now associate with social marketing campaigns (Hastings, 2017; Hochschild, 2006). The key elements of strategic marketing planning were evident in mobilizing anti-slavery sentiment and actualized through tactical deliberation; for example by using petitions, marches, logos, boycotts, logos, fliers and mass media outlets like newsletters (Hochschild, 2006). The campaign's success can be gauged only through its appeal to diverse British audiences and its ability to transform the public's moral belief "from unreflective to vehement condemnation" (Woods, 2015, p.677).

Campaign logos were ubiquitous and essential to raising awareness, interest, curiosity, and a desire for action (Smith, 2012). Perhaps the quintessential campaign logo was Josiah Wedgwood's seal, which depicted a kneeling Black slave below the caption 'Am I not a man and a brother'. Although this image would be unacceptable today, it was disseminated to Britons conditioned to viewing Blacks as abnegated from fundamental human qualities.

From the 'Negro-ape metaphor' to Nazi propaganda about 'Jews as humanity's vermin' (Lott, 1999; Mieder, 1982; Potts, 1997), dehumanizing rhetoric has been an insidious precursor of genocidal acts (Bain et al., 2013; Staunton, 1994; Zimbardo, 2011). Dehumanization is the "very phase where the death spiral of genocide" becomes acceptable (Staunton, 1994, p.214). In contrast, humanization begins with empathizing or imagining other people's perspectives, i.e., having a theory of mind (Fiske, 2009; Halpern and Weinstein, 2004; Harris and Fiske, 2009).

Wedgwood's rhetorical self-reflective question re-humanized Blacks as 'men' and 'brothers' worthy of empathy and compassion. Other iconic campaign images, such as slaves tightly packed into the interior of the infamous slave ship Brookes, aroused moral indignation by depicting slave traders' brutality (Woods, 2015). Although criticized for objectifying slaves, Wedgewood's seal forced viewers to imagine their experiences, and imagination is central to the re-humanization process that bridges humanization of 'others' through empathetic imagination (Nafisi, 2008; Oelofsen, 2009). Conversely, the lack of imagination is indifference, which renders 'others' lives and subjectivities invisible (Oelofsen, 2009). With 7000 posters hung nationwide and reproduced in newspapers, books, and pamphlets, these images reminded viewers of the cruelty slaves encountered (Lubbock, 2007; Smith, 2012).

The roughly 130 slave deaths about the slave ship Zong fomented Britons' moral indignation towards the slave trade. Olaudah Equiano—the first freed British slave—

spearheaded the ship owners' subsequent trial for manslaughter. The Zong affair provided pivotal motivation for establishing the Society for Effecting the Abolition of the Slave Trade in 1787. The following year, Parliament passed its first Slave Trade Act to regulate conditions slaves encountered during transit. Visual campaign elements and stories conditioned slaves to pursue their emancipation, as the 'Ode to Philanthropy' in the London Chronicle captured, 'All proclaim fair freedom's reign' (Drescher, 2012). Wedgewood's iconic seal reflected abettors' endorsement of the abolitionist movement (Clarkson, 1808).

Paralleling these public displays were consumer boycotts, which tangibilized support for the anti-slavery movement. In a prelude to modern consumer boycotts, U.S. abolitionists urged consumers to buy goods made by free workers (Glickman, 2004). These abolitionists, who were proponents of early U.S. Evangelical values and similar to modern consumer activists, viewed the "consumption system as the enemy and the blind and embedded consumers as an inextricable and essential part of that system" (Kozinets and Handelman, 2004, p.702).

Religious networks helped to disseminate the British abolitionists' appeals (Drescher, 1977). Spiritual allegiances bolstered the abolitionist movement's leading protagonists (Lysack, 2012). The Clapham sect, a group of Anglican evangelists, was Wilberforce's most ardent abettor; the Quakers supported Thomas Clarkson; the Methodists supported Equiano after his conversion to Christianity; and the Catholics supported Daniel O'Connell. These protagonists' writings show "how their interior spiritual lives nourished their activism and engagement with the abolition movement" (Lysack, 2012, p.169). Central to their appeals was re-humanizing the self before re-humanizing 'the other' and proselytizing that all human beings, but especially Christians, were innately compassionate. "[V]ivid, unforgettable descriptions of acts of great injustice done to their fellow human being" (Hochschild, 2006, p.366) were instrumental to

activating the moral agency and indignation essential to bridging the public-slave lacuna (Hasting, 2017; Woods, 2000). Such descriptions dovetail current theories about launching successful social movements, advancing social harmony between belligerent groups, and countering dehumanization (Bain et al., 2014). Hence, the abolitionists tapped into public opposition to the prevailing societal myth and provided an alternative.

In early 19th century Britain, anti-slavery messages proliferated when they began appealing to an expanding middle-class consciousness (Oldfield, 2012). Already dissatisfied with their ruling elite, the loss of the American colonies heightened the middle classes' self-referential reasons for abolishing slavery as a "way of reaffirming [Britain's] unique commitment to liberty" (Colley, 2005, p.354). This era was denoted by intensifying public "enthusiasm for parliamentary reform, for religious liberalisation….for virtually anything…that might prevent a similar national humiliation in the future" (Colley, 2005, p.143). Although the Zong massacre impelled moral indignation towards slave traders, these traders also represented the British elite class (Pettigrew, 2007). Given slavery's continuing legality in the U.S., British anti-slavery sentiment became an "emblem of national virtue" that served to "rebut American pretensions to superior freedoms" (Colley, 2005 p.54).

Anti-slavery appeals were diverse because their proponents were diverse: radicals who struggled for the rights of men, employees who were empathetic to 'the fellow oppressed', employers who viewed slavery as an affront to free-market economies, and traditionalists who still believed the British system embraced freedom (Colley, 2005). Consequently, Britons restored their reputation as champions of moral integrity, with the abolishment of slavery used as "irrefutable proof…[Britain's] power was founded on religion, on freedom and on moral calibre"

(Colley, 2005, p.359). Britons' establishing the Society for the Abolition Slave Trade in May 1787 was not coincidental (Oldfield, 2012).

Mystifying the Past and Present

Social myths with a strong ideological component or infused with beliefs and values promulgating by the dominant group's weltanschauung often "mystify or mask unsettling, social or political realities" (Dholakia and Firat, 2016, p.406). People adopt these myths to create self-mystification (i.e., self-delusion and cultural mystification) and self-justification experiences (Becker, 1997; Dholakia and Firat, 2016). Fundamentally, mystification is "confusion between appearance and reality, between knowledge and opinion" (Dholakia, 2016, p. 401) that obscures social reality by "masking or suppressing external social challenges to the dominant group" (Hirschman, 1993, p.538). Essential to promoting injurious or maladaptive ideas, mystification can entail "the fostering of delusional consciousness, a consciousness that suppresses the self-interest or class interest of the adopters and supplants it with a consciousness that is either diversionary or deflective or (more insidiously) oppositional and injurious" (Dholakia and Firat, 2016, p.407). Dominant groups use mystification to legitimize their social control identity projects (Eagleton, 1991). Capitalist elites use mystical associations (e.g., plutonomy, freedom, opportunity, and enterprise) to celebrate growing social inequality, thus rendering it "invisible, innocuous, acceptable, or even celebrated" (Dholakia and Firat, 2016, p.407).

Mystification relies on 'bounded awareness' and 'bounded ethicality' (i.e., cognitive constraints that make people unaware their decisions are counter to their values and principles) (Chugh and Bazerman, 2007; Chugh et al., 2005). Related to 'ethical blindness' (i.e., "temporary inability of a decision maker to see the ethical dimension of a decision at stake" (Palazzo et al., 2012, p.325)), these cognitive constraints can cause "good people to behave in pathological ways

that are alien to their nature" (Zimbardo 2007, p.195; also see Bandura, 2002; Tenbrunsel and Smith-Crowe, 2008). Ethical blindness tends to shift ethical decision making from a rational process often rooted in Kantian or utilitarian principles to an automatic, intuitive, or unconscious process (Haidt, 2012; Sonenshein, 2007). Situational pressures, institutional pressures, and rigid framing foster ethical blindness (Pallazzo et al., 2012).

'Frames' (i.e., "mental structures that simplify and guide our understanding of a complex reality" (Schoemaker and Russo, 2004, p.21)) limit ethical and moral decisions to an already accepted weltanschauung (Weick, 1995). "[B]y masking some elements and highlighting others, frames make people blind to some aspects of a problem" (Pallazo et al., 2013, p.327). 'Rigid framing', which occurs when a strong frame obscures alternative frames that would have provided a fuller perspective (Schoemaker and Russo, 2001), can induce ethical and moral reasoning tied to a "narrow and self-referential closed concept of reality" (Pallazo et al., 2013, p.327). To avoid such reasoning and consider a broader range of options, people should rely on a repertoire of frames (Schoemaker and Russo, 2001; Weick, 1995). When competing frames are silenced, discourse counter-constructions become unthinkable or unmentionable and presupposed discourse assumes greater dominance (Hall, 2003).

Restricting frames can lead to mental microcosms (i.e., rigid in-group weltanschauung-infused interpretations) that presume people's decisions are ethical or moral because they already have all relevant knowledge (Lakoff, 2004). Moral imagination—"an ability to imaginatively discern various possibilities for acting within a given situation and to envision the potential help and harm that are likely to result from a given action" (Johnson 1993, p.202)—is essential to overcoming such microcosms. Sadly, many Westerners' reliance on a moral disengagement frame for assessing the appropriateness of reparations for slave ancestors is a product of their

restricted moral imagination about the transatlantic slave trade's legacy and mystification of post-emancipation slavery (Brooks, 2004; Ulrich, 2001).

Mystifying Post-emancipation Slavery

Abolishing slavery became the grounds for re-asserting the British Empire's moral superiority, which legitimized its post-abolitionist colonial projects and "its particular claim to speak for those who were too weak to speak for themselves" (Oldfield, 2007, p.1). "Slavery has become spectacularly mythologised within English culture" (Wood, 2007, p.7) through national aggrandizement (e.g., re-created post-abolitionist imperialistic discourse, celebrated moral leadership, self-congratulatory claims about protecting 'the weak') (Oldfield, 2007). A new form of humanitarian imperialism began to define Britain and characterize a pan-European civilizing mission in Africa (Forclaz, 2015). Anti-slavery ceremonials typically positioned abolitionism as the noblest chapter in Britain's history of freedom, lauding Britons for their independence, freedom loving, idealism, bravery, and stewardship (Oldfield, 2007).

Ironically, "[t]he triumph of anti-slavery ideas…gave a new life to British racial prejudice" because the economic and social benefits to emancipated Blacks were "muted by state interventions whenever the free market seemed to be to the advantage of black over white interests" (Huzzey, 2012, p.209). The beneficent despotism that characterized 19th century Britain was partially a racist response to slave emancipation, as international slavery continued to yield handsome returns to British investors (Cooper et al., 2000; Drescher, 2009). Britain's formal abolition of slavery paralleled a rise in its informal entanglement with U.S. slavery to the extent that "even more than in its early days of development, slavery showed all the signs of being a vigorous global economic system" (Wavlin, 2011, p.201). The racism that fuelled the slave trade evolved into "freed individual slaves whilst justifying the domination of entire

nations" (Holt, 1992, p.17). Hence, the case for British colonialism showed the ongoing economic viability of slave labor well after emancipation (Drescher, 1997).

Rather than focusing on the slaves' emancipation or slavery's abolishment, Britons mythologized the abolitionists' legacy (Oldfield, 2007). Britain's slavery heritage fixated on slavery as the slave trade, thus relegating it to a regrettable maritime activity of the distant past (Beech, 2001). Defining slavery from a non-Black perspective silences representation of what occurred to the people who endured slavery and discounts Black and female activists' contributions to abolitionism (Cashmore and Jennings, 2001).

'Abolitionist discourse'—the type of post-genocidal amnesia that characterized Britain's national branding—perverts national mythologies via revisionist historical accounts (Waterton and Wilson, 2009). Such discourse, recounted during the U.K.'s bicentennial commemoration of abolitionism, focused on (1) ensuring Britons they live in better times by 'distancing the past', (2) assigning responsibility to the institution of slavery rather than to governments, businesses, or persons, (3) aggrandizing Britons as moral agents and thus stressing their benevolence, and (4) deflecting blame by, for example, inverting racism (i.e., blaming victims for their mistreatment) (Beech 2001; Oldfield, 2007; Waterton and Wilson, 2009). By mystifying the abolitionists' legacy, this commemoration perpetuated a positive national image while minimizing freedom from prolonged injustices (Paton, 2009; Paton and Webster, 2009; Streich, 2002; Waterton and Wilson, 2009).

In Western histories, "explicit and strong self-criticism for past generations' genocide, or other mass violence, is a rarity…[that shows] the *absence*, rather than the presence, of self-criticism for the in-group's mass violence" (Leach et al., 2013, p.47). Genocide psychologists and historians attribute this lack of self-criticism to memory repressing, limited monitoring, and

evaluating events as peripheral and meaningless, which contributes "to the same self-serving bias, aimed at silencing past contents capable of disadvantaging present-day social belonging" (Leone and Mastrovito, 2010, p.15). What emerges is collective false memories or shared selective representations of the past (Volpato and Licata, 2010), enabling a culture to "retain from the past only what still lives or is capable of living in the consciousness of the groups keeping the memory alive" (Halbwachs, 1980, p.80). By managing collective memories, in-groups can shape their society's weltanschauung because "the past [can] be continually…re-made, reconstructed in the interests of the present" (Bartlett, 1932, p.309), thus legitimizing current in-group actions (Volpato and Licata, 2010).

Politicians tend to shield their constituents from moral doubt attributable to ancestral wrongdoing. Achieving personal agency for people subject to oppression, inequality, or injustice requires appreciating how freedom complements social justice and caring (Nussbaum, 1995; Staveren, 2001), as evinced by the abolitionists' appeals to moral agency (Hastings, 2017). However, social justice and caring also relate to links between political and economic forces, which means freedom is intersectional and environmentally bound (Sen, 1999). To promote freedom and counter prevailing socio-political and economic dogma, British abolitionists aroused empathy and moral agency or appealed to retributive and moral indignation. As abolitionist Mary Wollstonecraft noted, "it is unsustainable to have a defence of freedom of human beings that separates some people whose liberties matter from others not to be included in that favoured category" (Sen, 1999, p.116).

The post-emancipation legacy of colonialism problematizes the story of freedom from the slave trade (Wahab and Jones, 2011). Calls for reparations could be considered counter-

marketing that recognizes ignoring historical injustices to Blacks is tantamount to ignoring their voices as wholesome, which is a counter-marketing prerequisite (Kotler, 1973).

Replacing Rhetoric with Reparations

When oppression, injustice, and inequality are substantial, like that caused by the transatlantic slave trade, implications for using reparations for the victims and possibly their ancestors are ethically daunting. Do policy makers risk their idealized national identity by facing specters or phantoms from the past (Derrida, 1993)? For example, poverty in Europe's African colonies was a byproduct of creating European wealth and luxury via the slave trade (DuBois, 1965). The human rights abuses of this trade produced 'unjust enrichment' (i.e., to possess "property, money, or benefits which in justice and equity belong to another" (Ballentine and Anderson, 1969, p.1320)) for Westerners. Obfuscating discussions about white privilege as the foundation of Western societies arising from slavery-derived economic gains normalizes 'unjust impoverishment' (i.e., "conditions of those who have suffered at the hands of those who have been unfairly enriched" (Feagin, 2004, p.51)). Thus, how can injured parties overcome the 'magic of mystification' nations often use to maintain a social self-image as moral and humane champions of global freedom?

A society's wealth distribution is 'just' only if the original acquisitions of holdings did not usurp anyone's rights (Nozick, 1974). Regarding the slave trade, the lack of reparations and affirmative action needed to rectify previous wrongs means ignoring the slave trade's history and its aftermath (Valls, 1999). Because injustices inflicted on Blacks via the slave trade were more extensive than the injustices inflicted on other racial groups, reparations are justifiable despite the 'British press' using inverted racism to discourage an open dialogue (Waterton and Wilson, 2009).

Full reparation payments for the ancestors of Black slaves would total trillions of dollars (Feagin, 2004; Marketti, 1990). Major international reparations efforts are ongoing. In 1991, representatives to the first Pan-African Conference on Reparations for African Casualties of European Colonialism called for "the international community to recognize that there is a unique and unprecedented moral debt owed to African peoples which has yet to be paid—the debt of compensation to the Africans as the most humiliated and exploited people of the last four centuries of modern history." The Caricom Reparations Committee is a twelve-nation committee demanding compensation from the U.K. and other European colonial powers "for the Crimes against Humanity of Native Genocide, the Transatlantic Slave Trade and a racialized system of chattel Slavery." Caricom's lobbying of the U.N. General Assembly lead to recognizing 2015 to 2024 as the "International Decade for People of African Descent" (UNGA, 68/237, 2013). Rather than mere statements of regret, Caricom's ten-point plan includes full formal apologies, compensatory reparations (e.g., debt cancellation), and affirmative action targeting Blacks' health and educational disparities.

An official apology and reparations remain key concerns among slave trade ancestors (Tibbles, 2008). British sentiment is mixed. Although two BBC polls showed most Britons—91.1% and 67%, respectively—opposed to an apology, a different poll showed 62.8% supported it (Tibbles, 2008). The U.K. government's stance remains that slavery was legal until 1807, so it cannot "formally apologise for it and leave itself open to claims to compensation" (Tibbles, 20008, p.300). Unfortunately, current manifestations of slavery, such as human trafficking, will continue to resist change until the transatlantic slave trade's legacy is fully recognized.

Modern Slavery

The transatlantic slave trade was the birth of modern slavery because it shows "that the spontaneous dynamic of civil society…in the modern sense of the term…is also pregnant with disaster and mayhem…[and] destructive patterns of human conduct" (Blackburn, 1998, pp.5-6). In essence, transatlantic slavery *was* modern slavery—a massive and ongoing tragedy with death estimates ranging from 12 million to 40 million persons (Bales, 1999; Gilroy, 1993; ILO, 2018; Kapstein, 2006). Dissociating modern slavery from the transatlantic slave trade obfuscates the "structural and systemic similarities in the two phenomena by mystifying and thus concealing the full structural participation of 'legitimate' enterprises and institutions in modern trafficking in humans" (Bravo, 2007, p.256). Moreover, by disavowing the role of race and racism (Davidson, 2015), modern abolitionist activists' calls for freedom shift responsibility for slavery from the underlying structural and dominant institutional apparatus that nurtured slavery (Bernstein, 2010).

Although modern slavery is characterized more by poverty than color (Bales, 2004), making it colorblind discounts victims living in nations once colonized by Western imperialists who embraced a racial superiority dogma (Davidson, 2015). Colorblind activists engage in a modern 'white (wo)man's burden' (Kempadoo, 2015) or 'rescue industry' that exculpates the Northern Hemisphere's industrial countries—the largest profiters from global trades in trafficked (especially sexual) labor (Belser et al, 2005)—from benefits attributable to structures and systems derived from colonialism (McGrath and Mieres, 2014).

Although transatlantic and modern slavery differ somewhat, the same global economic structures connect them (Bravo, 2007). Temporally distancing modern slavery from transatlantic slavery enables neo-abolitionist policy makers to relegate the latter's legacy to history's trash bin

and condemn modern slavery as a horror compelling a moral crusade against unconscionable evil (Forclaz, 2015). Shifting the problem of modern slavery to developing nations "absolve[es] the West from complicity in sustaining contemporary conditions of exploitation, force and violence in labor markets" (Davidson, 2015, p.15). Moreover, modern slaves risk deportation as illegal immigrants if they complain to authorities (Davidson, 2015). Thus, the cycle of mystification continues to reinforce the illusion of noble saviors rescuing 'mostly brown people' (Rothschild, 2011).

Exacerbating denial of the transatlantic slave trade as nascent modern slavery are calls for 'managed race migration', which is rooted in the slave and colonial states' efforts to oversee the migration of people considered 'outsiders and sub-persons' (Davidson, 2015). Many U.S. and U.K. policy makers demonize immigrants with blatantly dehumanizing rhetoric, referring to them as a flood, an invasion, aliens, leeches, bloodsuckers, and parasites (Musolff, 2015; Nevins, 2001). The language of modern slavery must be shunned before further dehumanizing its victims within an ideographical discourse or "taken-for-granted 'naturalized' world of common sense" (Hall, 2003, p.90). Hence, we dedicate the remainder of this article to reviewing the thematic symposium articles' contribution to the paradox of freedom that underpins discussions about slavery. We highlight implications for grasping the British abolitionists' legacy and how anti-slavery activists can emancipate modern slavery's victims.

Thematic Symposium Overview

Ron Hill's "Freedom of the Will and Consumption Restrictions: A Consideration of Vulnerable Consumer," which serves as a reminder of the limited studies examining abnegations of consumer free will, reflects marketing's dearth of qualitative freedom studies (Dirksmeier, 2014). Because free will is intertwined with "moral responsibility, love and friendship, and the

dignity of the person" (Hill, p.X), examining it reifies freedom within a family of values. Hill argues that restricting free will can activate vulnerable people's retro-coping mechanisms to attain freedom. His discussion on commodification as dehumanization relates to the experiences of Black slaves because it highlights humanness as the abnegateds' transcendental goal.

"[S]laves were the active agents of their own emancipation" (Matthews, 2006, p.2) and abolitionists subsequently used rebellions, which slaves actualized as self-transcendence, in their anti-slavery campaigns. Abolitionists "sympathized with, justified, and positively conceptualized and esteemed the slave's resistance to enslavement" (Matthews, 2006, p.12). However, 'bottom up—top down' emancipation was contested because many abolitionists reluctantly reified slave revolts while other abolitionists promoted slave uprisings as self-defense against oppression (Midgley, 1992). Without slave revolts, "the British anti-slavery movement would have been non-existent" (Matthews, 2006, p.5). Perhaps the key event in abolishing slavery, the Jamaican revolt of 1831 was decisive in precipitating emancipation (Green, 1976; Heuman, 1996).

By managing the parliamentary and associative plantation plutocracy's retributive action against the rebels, Wilberforce used the U.K.'s abolitionist movement to synergize revolts abroad. Arguing that unbearable conditions provided 'just cause' while fearing slave revolts could stall government-steered slave reforms, Wilberforce positioned the revolts as evidence 'pledges for change' should be formalized into action. Thus, Hill's account dovetails a 'bottom up—top down' approach to actualizing freedom through marketing, with grassroots activists guided and supported by public policy makers and vice versa. Non-cooperation between state and grassroots organizations challenging modern slavery remains a chronic problem. For governments and U.N. agencies to emancipate the world from modern slavery, "they must

partner with groups that can offer slaves a way to pull themselves up from bondage" and "encourage groups that empower slaves to free themselves" (Skinner, 2002, p.67).

Wilberforce faced a classic 'wicked problem', i.e., an intractable and inherently complex problem (Houghton and Tuffley, 2015; Rittel and Weber, 1973). With Rhino horn trafficking as the exemplar, "An Ethical Marketing Approach to Wicked Problems: Macromarketing for the Common Good" by Thomas Pittz, Susan Steiner, and Julie Pennington, posits that the common-good perspective is superior for addressing such problems. They argue the breadth of stakeholders in complex market systems precludes reliance on distributive justice solutions. Wildlife crime in the form of poaching is the most immediate threat to wild rhinoceroses (as well as other endangered species) and is a direct outcome of the marketing system's failure. Although the suggestion to legalize Rhino horn sales seemingly would provoke animal rights activists and conservationists, it encourages re-examining horn consumption from the perspective of often-silenced local or community stakeholders for whom the Rhino's full value cannot be optimized without considering the benefits of Rhino farming.

The common-good perspective has a long and established etiology from Aristotle to Rawls. Although Western political ideology traditionally links justice to the common good, "it is critical that the sources of *caritas* (charity) and mercy be recognized, respected, and reinforced as indispensable educators for and aspects of the common good" (Keys, 2013, p.244). Justice may cause peace indirectly, yet "charity surpasses justice [because due] to its very nature it causes peace…by forging true and good union within and among human beings" (Keys, 2013, p.253).

Management research largely ignores a common-good perspective (Cook, 2003; Crane, 2013). Consider the dearth of studies on corporate culpability for modern slavery, i.e., "denial of slavery in management studies" (Cook, 2003, p.1895), which has spurred calls for post-colonial

studies in management sciences (Westwood and Jack, 2007). Obfuscating slavery's history disregards modern slavery's victims while obscuring exploitive corporate policies. A common-good approach could shed light on modern slavery by unveiling stakeholders like the multinational corporations that permitted child labor in sweat shop industries (Klein, 2009).

In "Emancipatory Ethical Social Media Campaigns: Fostering Relationship Harmony and Peace," Arsalan Ghouri, Pervaiz Akhtar, Maya Vachkova, Muhammad Shahbaz, and Aviral Tiwari consider stifled disagreement between belligerent communities; specifically, Indians and Pakistanis. They queried Pakistani respondents to validate relational musicology as a way to foster social harmony by imagining the possibilities of cross-group friendship. Although they do not advocate a dual Indian-Pakistani national anthem, Ghouri et al. stress the potential of imaginary emancipatory ethics, echoing research validating the role of imagining cross-group friendship as a way to foster greater cross-group understanding (Crisp and Turner, 2009; Husnu and Crisp, 2010).

Emancipatory ethics shifts the focus from state-centric spheres of influence and understanding to eliminating the suffering of society's most vulnerable people (Mcdonald, 2007). Social activists, as agents of emancipatory ethics, can refute a status quo's maladaptive rhetoric. Like Pittz et al.'s call to recognize local voices in discourses about selling Rhino horns, Ghouri et al.'s call for a wider emancipatory appeal echoes Wilberforce and his contemporaries' approach to mass mobilization through protest and petitions. Unfortunately, anti-trafficking activists have breached the emancipatory ethics of representing modern slavery's victims while exposing state-centric policies that dehumanize legal immigrants as criminals or 'illegals' (Sharma, 2005). Continuing state-centric conformity in anti-trafficking campaigns contributes to mystifying the "role of nation-states in the process of migration" by concealing the causes of

"knowing why there is a lack of safe migration routes available" (Sharma, 2005, p.106). Moreover, emancipatory ethics suggests that "some of our strongest allies in ending slavery will be freed slaves. As more are liberated, they will guide us to better detection and better re-integration" (Bales, 2009, p.17).

In "Addressing the Ethical Challenge of Market Inclusion in Base of the Pyramid Markets: A Macromarketing Approach," Anaka Aiyar and Srinivas Venugopal assess Vietnam's public policy for providing greater transformational health services to bottom-of-the-pyramid consumers. They depart from traditional bottom-of-the-pyramid studies that consider 'profit seeking and poverty alleviation' intrinsic to neo-liberal government approaches, i.e., assuming quantitative freedom lifts people at the pyramid's bottom (Varman et al., 2012). Instead, they espouse market inclusion as necessitating public policy interventions that extend the 'profit seeking and profit alleviation' logic of neo-liberal governmentality, echoing the proposition that "eradication of poverty is the responsibility of governments" (Hill and Adrangi, 1999, p.145). Rooted in Rawlsian principles of 'justice as fairness', calls for a moral and ethical foundation to alleviate bottom-of-the-pyramid problems are proliferating (Dembek et al., 2016; Hahn, 2009).

Perhaps the most radical and yet optimistic and simple solution for decreasing global economic inequality is a 1% tax on aggregate income paid by wealthier countries to poorer countries as compensation for the former's cultural and environmental exploitation of the latter (Pogge, 2004; Scott et al., 2011). Alternatively, governments could help actualize their citizens' freedoms via policies that mandate decent living conditions for all, such as a liveable minimum wage or 'worker self-directed enterprises' that enable partial employee ownership (Kotler, 2002; Nussbaum, 1999; Sen, 1999). Although our abolitionist example focused on the promotion 'P' of marketing, other counter-marketing interventions pertain to freedom through marketing.

However, complications may arise when market and policy issues relate to objectification, discrimination, violence, and cultural sexism in which "subordination or refusal to acknowledge the identity of others" becomes normalized (Hein et al., 2016, p.226).

In "Pathways to Civic Engagement with Big Social Issues: An Integrated Approach," Dionysis Skarmeas, Constantinos Leonidou, Charalampos Saridakis, and Giuseppe Musarra advocate using civic engagement to resolve massive problems, such as global warming and climate change, income inequality, and world poverty and hunger. They develop and validate a personal civic engagement scale meant to assess donation behavior, support for socially responsible purchases, and positive word-of-mouth communications about a cause. Skarmeas et al. show that social value orientation, moral identity, and belief-in-a-just-world can create awareness of adverse consequences, shape attitudes, and encourage a sense of responsibility and obligation.

Civic engagement, through landmark petitions to Parliament, illustrates Wilberforce's strategy, the "decisive shift…[from] individual civic participation to a focus on collective action events" (Samson et al., 2005, p.675), and the aforementioned 'top down—bottom up' approach. Skarmeas et al.'s scale for civic participation echoes key characteristics of the anti-slave trade, whether through donations by Quaker networks, humanized symbolic products, boycotts, calls for free trade, or public discourse.

By summarizing the anti-slavery campaigns waged by abolitionists, Skarmeas et al.'s article has multiple implications for freedom through marketing because civic participation is integral to social movement theorists (Samson et al., 2005). The values that shaped the anti-slavery movement are central to their framework. Abolitionists often reminded audiences about slavery's amorality, retribution for slave traders as sinners, and emancipation for slaves and their

white Christian activists, which culminated in a social movement characterized by love-*caritas* and sacrifices for the common and just good. Thus, their article specifies the ingredients for sustaining anti-slavery movements and social activism in general. Critically, they urge activists to adopt a rigorous strategic approach to planning campaigns meant to 'move the masses'.

Discussion

Whether deserved or not, marketing's negative reputation for squandering resources while providing no social value, accounting improperly for externalities, corrupting marketplaces with exaggerated/deceitful product claims, and spurring needless and unhealthful consumption, may make freedom through marketing seem like Orwellian doublespeak (e.g., war is peace, freedom is slavery) (Lutz, 2016). However, it is not doublespeak because historical examples like the British abolitionists' campaign show that emancipating others through marketing is possible (Hastings, 2017). The near-global boycotting of Apartheid South Africa or FairTrade's spurring of ethically sourced consumption indicate that marketing can help activists represent silenced voices and challenge the underpinnings of inequality, injustice, and oppression. Whether marketing practitioners have done enough, relative to their knowledge and skills, remains for future debate. Nonetheless, we are hopeful that achieving freedom through marketing is complex but tractable. Indeed, Marketing 3.0 calls for freeing the human spirit to achieve its full potential for humanity (Kotler et al., 2010).

The British abolitionists' humanistic campaign, meant to emancipate silenced and repressed voices, resembled Marketing 3.0. These activists induced moral indignation and instilled moral agency by challenging the negative freedom that underpinned personal liberty at the expense of qualitative freedom for 'the other'. Achieving freedom for others dovetails with qualitative freedom, which reflects related freedom-nurturing values such as caring, equality,

justice, and empathy. The post-emancipation legacy of colonial and neo-colonial slavery—including modern slavery—indicates the abolitionists' legacy remains important. Prioritizing emancipatory ethics, engaging in 'top down—bottom up' resistance to oppression, inequality, and injustice, centralizing humanness in emancipatory campaigns, identifying silent stakeholders, and harnessing antecedents of civic participation, are some contributions this thematic symposium makes to anti-modern-slavery activists and pro-social activism.

Wilberforce inculcated public sacrifice on behalf of the common good by fostering love-*caritas* for slaves. Although his critics lamented his deliberations supporting slave revolts (Matthews, 2006), Wilberforce's positioning of these revolts within Christian humanitarian ethics helped mobilize Britons (Keys, 2013). He anticipated humanization scholars who contend empathy mediates re-humanizing the dehumanized (Fiske, 2009; Fiske and Harris, 2009). Extending his common-good lens to emancipatory ethics, the victims of transatlantic slavery and Black (often female) activists should define and shape the abolition story (Waterton and Wilson, 2009).

Key to emancipatory ethics is prioritizing silenced voices over state policy and status quo doctrine. During the aforementioned biennial abolition commemorations, the role of British and European slavery on Africa was ignored (Paton, 2009). In contrast, "while the Atlantic trade led to the enslavement of 10-12 million people, the process precipitated by [the Slave Trade Act of 1807] led to the 'enslavement' of an entire continent of hundreds of millions" (Paton, 2009, p.284). Indeed, the U.K.'s decision to mark August 23rd as its anti-slavery day risks public memory of the slave trade (Paton and Webster, 2009). Like the U.N., perhaps a decade of commemorating the slave trade's injustices would instill the moral agency and moral indignation Wilberforce and his contemporaries envisaged. Rather than the U.S.'s toothless annual Black

History Month, the U.N.'s International Decade for People of African Descent better represents the emancipatory voices raised against injustices inflicted on Africans. The latter remembrance avoids the paradox of freedom promulgated by sugarcoated and temporally distanced British narratives and commemorations about Britons' role in the transatlantic slave trade (Paton, 2009; Waterton and Wilson, 2009). Without such a shift, the post-abolitionist discourse will continue to evolve "into a wider narrative that emphasises liberal humanitarianism" (Paton, 2009, p.284), like the colonial fusion of economics and humanitarianism in the pan-European colonialists' 'scramble for Africa' (Forclaz, 2015).

Like the transformative dialogic approach for gender justice, which integrates justice, capabilities, and recognition, a multidimensional and multi-paradigmatic perspective would help to resolve racial inequalities derived from the transatlantic slave trade's prolonged injustices (Streich, 2002). Because memory is essential to developing notions of justice, developing a moderate cosmopolitan identity in the West that is more "open to history and memory as constitutive of individual and group identities" (Streich, 2002, p.530) would recognize the slave trade's legacy as ongoing injustice (Rawls, 1971; Nozick, 1974). Recognition, in terms of formal apologies and restitution by balancing basic capabilities, is critical to affirming "those who suffered the injustice [and have] moral standing" (Roberts, 2001, p.358).

When mobilizing for social change, especially for overcoming oppression, activists can participate in harnessing people's interior lives by nurturing "interconnectedness of all human beings and to recognize the inherent humanness and value in all of us" (Todd, 2009, p.178). Compassion flourishes when people experience inner- versus outer-world discrepancies, resolvable by working towards emancipating other people (Todd, 2009). Attributing humaneness to oneself and other people requires social harmony gained via self-other individuation and

collective solidarity (Jung, 1966). However, self-other individuation "always involves a rupture of the normalized roles of the surrounding social collective," especially if the germane social norms reflect repressive agendas (Lorenz and Watkins, 2000, p.7). In confessing to pro-social attitudes contrary to prevailing maladaptive social norms, public individuation—i.e., recognizing and publicizing one's distinctiveness as a moral person—can spur subsequent activism (Maslach et al., 1985).

An inherent problem in the 'freedom-related economic underpinnings of globalization' is it "liberates but at the same time puts pressure on nations and people around the world" (Kotler et al., 2010, p.12). Freedom should come naturally, as our free will is bound by moral responsibility (Dirksmeier, 2014). Thus, freedom should be viewed through the prism of morality because "morality is the condition under which alone a rational being can be an end-in-himself" (Kant, 1785/2002). Through "our ability to be moral we gain freedom, both to be moral, and also derivatively, to be immoral" (Dirksmeier, 2014, p.66). Thus, freedom through marketing can help to attain qualitative freedom for the people it aspires to liberate.

Recommendations for Further Research

Many scholarly domains in marketing demand re-thinking extant theory and practice to "sketch out the spaces of freedom and possibility" (Tadajewski, 2010, p.217). For example, 'critical marketing' scholars could create knowledge that relies on race as a self-reflective prism by drawing from postcolonial theory, critical race theory, critical whiteness theory, critical multicultural theory, or a combination of these perspectives (Tadajewski, 2010). Social marketing emerged in response to the question 'Why can't you sell brotherhood like you sell soap?' (Kotler and Zaltman, 1971). Hence, social business can "combat processes that impoverish people, or underpin oppression and structural injustice" (Baker, 2014, p.272). Much

transformative marketing has been achieved but if we are to embrace the challenges of inequality, injustice and oppression with objectivity and representation for silenced voices as our ethos, then we will need to embrace interdisciplinary approaches.

Whether on re-humanizing migrants or tackling modern child and sex slave trades, additional research on freedom through marketing is needed. Ceteris paribus, we recommend such research take an emancipatory ethics approach that considers state and corporate policy separately from the victims of inequality, oppression, and injustice because the former may create the latter. Achieving freedom for other people begins with self-reflection about personal and societal approaches to engaging victims. The abolitionists' story reinforces self-reflection can drive of mass mobilization for emancipatory change. Hence, the urgency for further research on marketing interventions to actualize freedom.

References

Appleby, J. (1992). *Liberalism and republicanism in the historical imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bain, P.G., Vaes, J., & Leyens, J.P. (2013). Advances in understanding humanness and dehumanization. In P.G. Bain, J. Vaes, & J.P. Leyens (Eds.), *Humanness and dehumanization* (pp. 9-18). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Bales, K. (2009). Winning the fight: Eradicating slavery in the Modern Age. *Harvard International Review*, *31*(1), 14. https://www.kean.edu/~jkeil/Welcome_files/Bales_Winning_the_Fight.pdf

Bales, K. (1999). *Disposable people: New slavery in the global economy*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.

Ballentine, J., & Anderson, W.S. (1969). *Ballentine's law dictionary, with pronunciations*. Rochester, NY: Lawyers Co-operative Pub. Co.

Baker, M. (2014). Social business – everybody's business. In R. Varey & M. Pirson (Eds.), *Humanistic marketing* (pp. 257-274). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Baker, W. (1970). William Wilberforce on the idea of Negro inferiority. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, *31*(3), 433-440. https://doi.org.10.2307/2708515

Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education*, *31*(2), 101-119. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305724022014322

Bartlett, F.C. (1932). *Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Beckles, H. (2013). *Britain's Black debt: Reparations for Caribbean slavery and native genocide* (Vol. 195). Kingston, Jamaica: University of West Indies Press.

Becker E. (1997). *The denial of death*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Beckert, S., & Rockman, S. (Eds.) (2016). *Slavery's capitalism: A new history of American economic development*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Beech, J.G. (2001). The marketing of slavery heritage in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration, 2*(3-4), 85-106. https://doi.org/10.1300/J149v02n03_04

Belser, P., De Cock, M., & Mehran, F. (2005). *ILO minimum estimate of forced labour in the world*. Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office. Accessed 5 April 2019. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_norm/---declaration/documents/publication/wcms_081913.pdf

Berlin, I. (1998). *Many thousands gone: The first two centuries of slavery in North America.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bernstein, E. (2010). Militarized humanitarianism meets carceral feminism: The politics of sex, rights, and freedom in contemporary antitrafficking campaigns. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 36*(1), 45-71. https://doi.org/10.1086/652918

Bittker, B.I. (1973). *The case for Black reparations*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Black, J. (2015). *The Atlantic slave trade in world history*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Blackburn, R. (1998). *The making of new world slavery: From the baroque to the modern, 1492-1800*. London, UK: Verso.

Blackburn, R. (1988). *The overthrow of colonial slavery*. London, UK: Verso.

Borgerson, J.L., & Schroeder, J.E. (2002). Ethical issues of global marketing: Avoiding bad faith in visual representation. *European Journal of Marketing, 36*(5/6), 570-594. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090560210422399

Boyd, J.P. (Ed.) (1953). *The papers of Thomas Jefferson,* Vol. 8. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bravo, K.E. (2007). Exploring the analogy between modern trafficking in humans and the trans-Atlantic slave trade. *Boston University International Law Journal, 25 (2)*. 209-295. https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.996455

Brooks, R.L. (2004). Getting reparations for slavery right-response to Posner and Vermeule. *Notre Dame Law Review, 80,* 251-288.

Burton, D. (2009). "Reading" whiteness in consumer research. *Consumption, Markets and Culture, 12*(2), 171-201. https://doi.org/10.1080/10253860902840982

Burton, D. (2002). Towards a critical multicultural marketing theory. *Marketing Theory, 2*(2), 207-236. https://doi.org/10.1177%2F147059310222004

Cashmore, E., & Jennings, J. (Eds.). (2001). *Racism: Essential readings*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Chugh, D., & Bazerman, M.H. (2007). Bounded awareness: What you fail to see can hurt you. *Mind & Society, 6*(1), 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11299-006-0020-4

Chugh, D., Bazerman, M.H., & Banaji, M.R. (2005). Bounded ethicality as a psychological barrier to recognizing conflicts of interest. In D.A. Moore, D.M. Cain, G. Loewenstein, & M.H. Bazerman (Eds.), *Conflicts of interest: Challenges and solutions in business, law, medicine, and public policy* (pp. 74-95). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Clarkson, T. (1808). The history of the rise, progress, and accomplishment of the abolition of the African slave-trade by the British Parliament, 2 vols. London, UK: L. Taylor. Accessed 1 April 2019. https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/1869

Colley, L. (2005). *Britons: Forging the nation, 1707-1837*. New Haven, CT: Yale University

Press.

Cooke, B. (2003). The denial of slavery in management studies. *Journal of Management Studies*, *40*(8), 1895-1918.https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1467-6486.2003.00405.x

Crane, A. (2013). Modern slavery as a management practice: Exploring the conditions and capabilities for human exploitation. *Academy of Management Review*, *38*(1), 49-69. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.0145

Cooper, F. (2000). *Africa since 1940: The past of the present*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Crisp, R.J., & Turner, R.N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions?: Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, *64*(4), 231-240. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0014718

Crocker, A.D. (1995). Functioning and capability: The foundations of Sen's and Nussbaum's development ethics. In M. Nussbaum & J. Glover (Eds.), *Women, culture and development: A study of human capabilities* (pp. 153-198). Delhi, India: Oxford University Press.

Davidson, J.O.C. (2015). *Modern slavery: The margins of freedom*. Houndmills, UK: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137297297

Davis, M. (2001). *Late Victorian holocausts: El Niño famines and the making of the third world*. London, UK: Verso.

Davis, D.B. (1975). *The problem of slavery in the age of revolution, 1770-1823*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Dembek, K., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (2016). A systematic review of the bottom of the pyramid literature. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2016(1). https://doi.org/10.5465/AMBPP.2016.18011

Derrida, J. (1993). *Specters of Marx: The state of the debt, the work of mourning and the new international*, trans. by Peggy Kamuf, London, UK: Routledge.

Dholakia, N (2016). Marketing as mystification, *Marketing Theory*, *16*(3), 401-426.

Dholakia, N., & Firat, F. (2016). Mystifying class: Marketing of inequality and the rise of delusive consciousness. *Marketing Theory*, *16*(3), 401-426. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593115619971

Dierksmeier, C., & Pirson, M. (2010). The modern corporation and the idea of freedom. *Philosophy of Management*, *9*(3), 5-25. https://doi.org/10.5840/pom2010932

Dierksmeier, C. (2011). The freedom–responsibility nexus in management philosophy and business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics, 101*(2), 263-283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0721-9

Dierksmeier, C., & Pirson, M. (2010). The modern corporation and the idea of freedom. *Philosophy of Management*, *9*(3), 5-25. https://doi.org/10.5840/pom2010932

Draper, N. (2009). *The price of emancipation: Slave-ownership, compensation and British society at the end of slavery*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Drescher, S. (2012). The shocking birth of British abolitionism. *Slavery & Abolition*, *33*(4), 571-593. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144039X.2011.644070

Drescher, S. (2009). *Abolition: A history of slavery and antislavery*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Drescher, S. (1997). Capitalism and slavery after fifty years. *Slavery & Abolition*, *18*(3), 212-227.

Drescher, S. (1977). *Econocide: British slavery in the era of abolition*. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

DuBois, W.E.B. (1946). *The world and Africa*. New York, NY: International Publishers.

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An introduction*. London, UK: Routledge.

Feagin, J.R. (2004). Documenting the costs of slavery, segregation, and contemporary racism: Why reparations are in order for African Americans. *Harvard. Black Letter Law Journal, 20,* 49-81.

Fiske, S.T. (2009). From dehumanization and objectification to rehumanization: Neuroimaging studies on the building blocks of empathy. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1167*(1), 31-34. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04544.x

Foner, E. (1994). The meaning of freedom in the age of emancipation. *The Journal of American History, 81*(2), 435-460. https://doi.org/10.2307/2081167

Forclaz, A.R. (2015). *Humanitarian imperialism: The politics of anti-slavery activism, 1880-1940*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from freedom*. New York, NY: Farrar & Rinehart.

Gasper, D., & Van Staveren, I. (2003). Development as freedom and as what else? *Feminist Economics, 9*(2-3), 137-161. https://doi.org/10.1080/1354570032000078663

Gilroy, P. (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness*. London, UK: Verso.

Glickman, L.B. (2004). "Buy for the sake of the slave": Abolitionism and the origins of American consumer activism. *American Quarterly, 56*(4), 889-912. https://doi.org/10.1353/aq.2004.0056

Grant, C. (2013). Freedom and oppression. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics, 12*(4), 413-425. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470594X13496070

Gray, T. (1991). *Freedom*. London, UK: Macmillan.

Green, W.L. (1976). *British slave emancipation: The sugar colonies and the great experiment,*

1830-1865. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hahn, R. (2009). The ethical rational of business for the poor - integrating the concepts bottom of the pyramid, sustainable development, and corporate citizenship. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *84*(3), 313-324. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-008-9711-6

Hague, W. (2008). *William Wilberforce: The life of the great anti-slave trade campaigner*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Inc.

Haidt, J. (2012). *The righteous mind: Why good people are divided by politics and religion*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.

Halbwachs, M. (1980). Historical memory and collective memory. In M. Halbwachs, F.J. Ditter, & V.Y. Ditter (Eds.), *The collective memory* (pp. 50-87). New York, NY: Harper & Row.

Hall, S. (2003). *The Whites of their eyes: Racist ideologies in the media*. In G. Dines & J.M. Humez (Eds.), *Gender, race, and class in the media, 2nd ed.* (pp.135-158). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hall, C., Draper, N., McClelland, K., Donington, K., & Lang, R. (2014). *Legacies of British slave-ownership: Colonial slavery and the formation of Victorian Britain*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Halpern, J., & Weinstein, H.M. (2004). Rehumanizing the other: Empathy and reconciliation. *Human Rights Quarterly, 26*(1), 561-583. https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2004.0036

Harris, L.T., & Fiske, S.T. (2009). Social neuroscience evidence for dehumanised perception. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *20*(1), 192-231. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280902954988

Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., & Holland, E. (2013). The psychology of humanness. In S.J. Gervais

(Ed.), *Objectification and (de)humanization* (pp. 25-51). New York, NY: Springer.

Hastings, G. (2017). Rebels with a cause: The spiritual dimension of social marketing. *Journal of Social Marketing*, *7*(2), 223-232. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSOCM-02-2017-0010

Hayward, J.E.S. (1985). *Out of slavery: Abolition and after*. London, UK: Frank Cass and Co. Ltd.

Hein, W., Steinfield, L., Ourahmoune, N., Coleman, C.A., Zayer, L.T., & Littlefield, J. (2016). Gender justice and the market: A transformative consumer research perspective. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *35*(2), 223-236. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.15.146

Heuman, G. (1996). A tale of two Jamaican rebellions. *Jamaican Historical Review*, *19*(1), 1-8.

Hill, R.P., & Adrangi, B. (1999). Global poverty and the United Nations. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *18*(2), 135-146. https://doi.org/10.1177/074391569901800201

Hirschman, E.C. (1993). Ideology in consumer research, 1980 and 1990: A Marxist and feminist critique. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *19*(4), 537-555. https://doi.org/10.1086/209321

Hochschild, A. (1999). *King Leopold's ghost: A story of greed, terror, and heroism in colonial Africa*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Hochschild, A. (2006). *Bury the chains: the British struggle to abolish slavery*. Sydney, Australia: Pan Macmillan.

Holt, T.C. (1992). *The problem of freedom: Race, labor, and politics in Jamaica and Britain, 1832-1938*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Houghton, L., & Tuffley, D. (2015). Towards a methodology of wicked problem exploration through concept shifting and tension point analysis. *Systems Research & Behavioral Science*, *32*(3), 283-297. https://doi.org/10.1002/sres.2223

Husnu, S., & Crisp, R.J. (2010). Elaboration enhances the imagined contact effect. *Journal of*

Experimental Social Psychology, *46*(6), 943-950. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.014

Huzzey, R. (2012). *Freedom burning: Anti-slavery and empire in Victorian Britain*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

ILO (2018). "40 million in modern slavery and 152 million in child labour around the world" International Labour Organisation, Accessed 11 March 2019. https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_574717/lang--en/index.htm

Inikori, J.E. (1987). Slavery and the development of industrial capitalism in England. *The Journal of Interdisciplinary History*, *17*(4), 771-793. https://doi.org.10.2307/204653

Irving, S., Harrison, R., & Rayner, M. (2002). Ethical consumerism–democracy through the wallet. *Journal of Research for Consumers*, *3*(3), 63-83.

Jack, G.(2008).Postcolonialism and marketing. In M. Tadajewski & D. Brownlie (Eds.), *Critical marketing: Issues in contemporary marketing* (pp. 363–384). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Johnson, M. (1993). *Moral imagination*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, P. (2010). *Making the market: Victorian origins of corporate capitalism*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Johnston, K. (2013). The messy link between slave owners and modern management. *Harvard Business School-Working Knowledge*. https://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/the-messy-link-between-slave-owners-and-modern-management

Jones, C. (Ed.) (2011). *Free at last? Reflections on freedom and the abolition of the British transatlantic slave trade*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Jung, C.G. (1966). Two essays on analytical psychology. *CW Vol. VII*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kant, I. (1785/2002). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals*. Oxford, UK: Oxford

University Press.

Kapstein, E.B. (2006). The new global slave trade. *Foreign Affairs*, *85*, 103-115. https://doi.org. 10.2307/20032146

Kempadoo, K. (2015). The modern-day white (wo)man's burden: Trends in anti-trafficking and anti-slavery campaigns. *Journal of Human Trafficking*, *1*(1), 8-20. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322705.2015.1006120

Keys, M.M. (2013). Why justice is not enough: Mercy, love-caritas, and the common good. In P.C. Lo & D. Solomon (Eds.), *The common good: Chinese and American perspectives* (pp. 243-259). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Klein, N. (2009). *No logo: No space, no choice, no jobs.* New York, NY: Picador.

Kotler, P. (1973). The major tasks of marketing management. *Journal of Marketing*, *37*(4), 42-49. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224297303700407

Kotler, P., & Levy, S.J. (1971). Demarketing, yes, demarketing. *Harvard Business Review*, *79*, 74-80.

Kotler, P., & Mindak, W. (1978). Marketing and public relations: Should they be partners or rivals? *Journal of Marketing*, *42*(4), 13-20. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224297804200402

Kotler, P., & Zaltman, G. (1971). Social marketing: An approach to planned social change. *Journal of Marketing*, *35*(3), 3-12. https://doi.org/10.1177/002224297103500302

Kotler, P., Kartajaya, H., & Setiawan, I. (2010). *Marketing 3.0: From products to customers to the human spirit*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Kozinets, R.V., & Handelman, J.M. (2004). Adversaries of consumption: Consumer movements, activism, and ideology. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *31*(3), 691-704. https://doi.org/10.1086/425104

Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant!*. White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green Publishing.

Leach, C.W., Zeineddine, F.B., & Čehajić-Clancy, S. (2013). Moral immemorial: The rarity of self-criticism for previous generations' genocide or mass violence. *Journal of Social Issues, 69*(1), 34-53. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12002

Leone, G., & Mastrovito, T. (2010). Learning about our shameful past: A socio-psychological analysis of present-day historical narratives of Italian colonial wars. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, *4*(1), 11-27. https://doi.org.10/4119/UNIBI/ijvc.57

Licata, L., & Volpato, C. (2010). Introduction: Collective memories of colonial violence. *International Journal of Conflict & Violence*, *4*(1), 4-10. https://doi.org.10.4119/UNIBI/ijvc.61

Liu, J.H., & Hilton, D.J. (2005). How the past weighs on the present: Social representations of history and their role in identity politics. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 44*(4), 537-556. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466605X27162

Liu, J.H., Onar, N.F., & Woodward, M.W. (2014). Symbologies, technologies, and identities: Critical junctures theory and the multi-layered nation-state. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 43*(Part A), 2-12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.08.012

Lorenz, H.S., & Watkins, M. (2000). Depth psychology and colonialism: Individuation, seeing through, and liberation. *The International Symposium of Archetypal Psychology*, August 31-September 4. Santa Barbara, CA: University of California.

Lott, T.L. (1999). *Invention of race*. New York, NY: Wiley.

Lovejoy, P.E. (1989). The impact of the Atlantic slave trade on Africa: A review of the literature. *The Journal of African History, 30*(3), 365-394. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0021853700024439

Lubbock, T. (2007). Thomas Clarkson et al: The British slave ship 'Brookes' (1789). *The Independent*. Accessed 1 April 2019. http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/art-and-architecture/great- works/clarkson-thomas-et-al-the-british-slave-ship-brookes-1789-744401.html

Lutz, W. (2016). *Doublespeak—From revenue enchancement to terminal living: How government, business, advertisers, and others use language to deceive you*. New York, NY: Ig Publishing.

Lysack, M. (2012). The abolition of slavery movement as a moral movement: Ethical resources, spiritual roots, and strategies for social change. *Journal of Religion & Spirituality in Social Work: Social Thought*, *31*(1-2), 150-171. https://doi.org/10.1080/15426432.2012.647962

Marketti, J. (1990). Estimated present value of income diverted during slavery. In R.F. America (Ed.), *The wealth of races: The present value of benefits from past injustices* (pp. 107-112). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.

Maslach, C., Stapp, J., & Santee, R.T. (1985). Individuation: Conceptual analysis and assessment. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *49*(3), 729-738. https://doi.org/10.1080/15426432.2012.647962

Matthews, G. (2006). *Caribbean slave revolts and the British abolitionist movement*. Baton Rouge. LA: LSU Press.

McDonald, M. (2009). Emancipation and critical terrorism studies. In R. Jackson, M.B. Smyth, & J. Gunning (Eds.), *Critical terrorism studies: A new research agenda*. (pp.123-137). London, UK: Routledge.

McGrath, S., & Mieres, F. (2014). Mapping the politics of national rankings in the movement against "modern slavery." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*. Accessed 6

April 2019. https://www.opendemocracy.net/beyondslavery/siobh%C3%A1n-mcgrath-fabiola-mieres/mapping-politics-of-national-rankings-in-movement-again

Metaxas, E. (2007). *Amazing grace: William Wilberforce and the heroic campaign to end slavery*. New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers.

Mieder, W. (1982). Proverbs in Nazi Germany: The promulgation of anti-Semitism and stereotypes through folklore. *The Journal of American Folklore*, *95*(378), 435-464. http://doi.org/10.2307/540750

Midgley, C. (1992). *Women against slavery: The British campaigns, 1780-1870*. London, UK: Routledge.

Mintz, S.W. (1986). *Sweetness and power: The place of sugar in modern history*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Musolff, A. (2015). Dehumanizing metaphors in UK immigrant debates in press and online media. *Journal of Language Aggression and Conflict*, *3*(1), 41-56. https://doi.org/10.1075/jlac.3.1.02mus

Nafisi, A. (2008). *Reading Lolita in Tehran: A memoir in books*. New York, NY: Random House.

Nevins, J. (2001). *Operation gatekeeper: The rise of the "illegal alien" and the remaking of the US–Mexico boundary*. London, UK: Routledge.

Nozick, R. (1974). *Anarchy, state, and utopia*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Nussbaum, M.C. (1999). *Sex and social justice*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Nussbaum, M. (1995). Human capabilities, female human beings. *Women, culture and development: A study of human capabilities*, 61-104. In Nussbaum, M. C., & Glover, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Women, culture, and development: A study of human capabilities*. Oxford,

UK: Clarendon Press.

Oelofsen, R. (2009). De-and rehumanization in the wake of atrocities. *South African Journal of Philosophy, 28*(2), 178-188. https://doi.org/10.4314/sajpem.v28i2.46677

Oldfield, J.R. (2007). *Chords of freedom: Commemoration, ritual and British transatlantic slavery*. Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Oldfield, J.R. (2012). *Popular politics and British anti-slavery: The mobilisation of public opinion against the slave trade, 1787-1807*. London, UK: Routledge.

Osterhammel, J., & Petersson, N. (2005). *Globalization: A short history*, trans. Dona Geyer. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Palazzo, G., Krings, F., & Hoffrage, U. (2012). Ethical blindness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *109*(3), 323-338. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-1130-4

Parijs, P.V. (1997). *Real freedom for all: What (if anything) can justify capitalism?* Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Paton, D. (2009). Interpreting the bicentenary in Britain. *Slavery & Abolition*, *30*(2), 277-289. https://doi.org/10.1080/01440390902818989

Paton, D., & Webster, J. (2009). Remembering slave trade abolitions: Reflections on 2007 in international perspective. *Slavery & Aboliotion 30(2)*, 161-167. https://doi.org/10.1080/01440390902818450

Patterson, O. (1991). *Freedom in the making of western culture*. London, UK: I.B. Tauris.

Pettigrew, W.A. (2007). Free to enslave: Politics and the escalation of Britain's transatlantic slave trade, 1688-1714. *William & Mary Quarterly*, *64*(1), 3-38.

Pirson, M. (2017). A humanistic perspective for management theory: Protecting dignity and promoting well-being. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-

3755-4

Plumb, J.H. (1989). *The American experience: The collected essays of JH Plumb*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Pogge, T.W. (2004). Justice across borders: Brief for a global resources dividend. In M. Clayton & A. Williams (Eds.), *Social justice* (pp. 265-285). London, UK: Blackwell.

Potts, R.G. (1997). The social construction and social marketing of the "dangerous Black man". *Journal of African American Studies*, *2*(4), 11-24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12111-997-1002-2

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Rittel, H.W., & Webber, M.M. (1973). Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences*, *4*(2), 155-169. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01405730

Roberts, R.C. (2001). Why have the injustices perpetrated against Blacks in America not been rectified? *Journal of Social Philosophy*, *32*(3), 357-373. https://doi.org/10.1111/0047-2786.00099

Rogozinski, J. (2000). *A brief history of the Caribbean: From the Arawak and Carib to the present.* New York, NY: Penguin Putnam Inc.

Rosenthal, C. (2018). *Accounting for slavery: Masters and management*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rothschild, N. (2011, March 12). Human trafficking: The white hollywood star's burden. Anorak. Retrieved 1 April 2019. http://www.anorak.co.uk/275916/keyposts/human-trafficking-the-white-hollywood-stars-burden.html/

Sampson, R.J., McAdam, D., MacIndoe, H., & Weffer-Elizondo, S. (2005). Civil society reconsidered: The durable nature and community structure of collective civic action.

American Journal of Sociology, *111*(3), 673-714. https://doi.org/10.1086/497351

Scerri, A. (2009). Paradoxes of increased individuation and public awareness of environmental issues. *Environmental Politics*, *18*(4), 467-485. https://doi.org/10.1080/09644010903007344

Schoemaker, P.J.H., & Russo, J.E. (2001). Managing frames to make better decisions. In S. Hoch & H. Kunreuther (Eds.), *Wharton on making decisions* (pp. 131-155). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Schoemaker, P.J.H. (2004). Forecasting and scenario planning: The challenges of uncertainty and complexity. In D.J. Koehler & N. Harvey (Eds.), *Blackwell handbook of judgment and decision making* (pp. 274-296). Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing.

Schut, T., & Grassiani, E. (2017). Introduction: Freedom. *Etnofoor*, *29*(1), 7-10.

Scott, L., Williams, J.D., Baker, S.M., Brace-Govan, J., Downey, H., Hakstian, A.M., Henderson, G.R., Loroz, P.S., & Webb, D. (2011). Beyond poverty: Social justice in a global marketplace. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *30*(1), 39-46. https://doi.org/10.1509/jppm.30.1.39

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Sherwood, M. (2012). The trade in enslaved Africans and slavery after 1807. In F. Brennan & J. Packer (Eds.), *Colonialism, slavery, reparations and trade: Remedying the 'past'?* (pp. 2-37). Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Skinner, E. B. (2008). A world enslaved. *Foreign Policy*, *165*(March-April), 62-67. https://foreignpolicy.com/2009/10/08/a-world-enslaved/

Smallwood, S. (2014) Freedom. In B. Burgett & G. Hendler (Eds.), *Keywords for American cultural studies* (pp. 111-115). New York, NY: NYU Press.

Smith, R. (2012). Learning from the abolitionists, the first social movement. *BMJ, 345*.

https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e8301

Sonenshein, S. (2007). The role of construction, intuition, and justification in responding to ethical issues at work: The sensemaking-intuition model. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(4), 1022-1040. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/20159354

Stannard, D.E. (1992). *The conquest of the New World: American holocaust*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Stanton 1.G.H. (2004). Could the Rwandan genocide have been prevented?. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *6*(2), 211-228. https://doi.org/10.1080/1462352042000225958

Staveren, I. (2001). *The values of economics. An Aristotelian perspective*. London, UK: Routledge.

Stern, B.B. (1990). Literary criticism and the history of marketing thought: A new perspective on "reading" marketing theory. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *18*(4), 329-336. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02723918

Streich, G.W. (2002). Is there a right to forget? Historical injustices, race, memory, and identity. *New Political Science*, *24*(4), 525-542. https://doi.org/10.1080/0739314022000025363

Tadajewski, M. (2010). Critical marketing studies: Logical empiricism, 'critical performativity' and marketing practice. *Marketing Theory*, *10*(2), 210-222. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593110366671

Taylor, K. (2004). *Brainwashing: The science of thought control*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Tenbrunsel, A.E., & Smith-Crowe, K. (2008). Ethical decision making: Where we've been and where we're going. *The Academy of Management Annals*, *2*(1), 545-607.

https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520802211677

Tibbles, A. (2008). Facing slavery's past: The bicentenary of the abolition of the British slave trade. *Slavery & Abolition*, *29*(2), 293-303. https://doi.org/10.1080/01440390802028200

Todd, S. (2009). Mobilizing communities for social change: Integrating mindfulness and passionate politics. In S. Hick (Ed.), *Mindfulness and social work* (pp. 171-187). Chicago, IL: Lyceum Publications.

Ulrich, G. (2001). The moral case for reparations: Three theses about reparations for past wrongs. *Human Rights in Development Online*, *7*(1), 369-384.

UNGA (2014), Programme of activities for the implementation of the international decade for people of African descent, Accessed 14 January 2019. https://www.un.org/en/events/africandescentdecade/pdf/A.RES.69.16_IDPAD.pdf

Valls, A. (1999). The libertarian case for affirmative action. *Social Theory and Practice*, *25*(2), 299-323. https://doi.org/10.5840/soctheorpract199925218

Varey, R., & Pirson, M. (Eds.) (2014). *Humanistic marketing*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.

Varman, R., Skålén, P., & Belk, R.W. (2012). Conflicts at the bottom of the pyramid: Profitability, poverty alleviation, and neoliberal governmentality. *Journal of Public Policy & Marketing*, *31*(1), 19-35. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470593113489195

Wahab, A., & Jones, C. (2011). *Free at last? Reflections on freedom and the abolition of the British transatlantic slave trade*. Newcastle, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Waterton, E., & Wilson, R. (2009). Talking the talk: Policy, popular and media responses to the bicentenary of the abolition of the slave trade using the abolition discourse. *Discourse & Society*, *20*(3), 381-399. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926509102409

Walvin, J. (2011). Why did the British abolish the slave trade? Econocide revisited. *Slavery & Abolition*, *32*(4), 583-588. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144039X.2011.625777

Waytz, A., Schroeder, J., & Epley, N. (2013). The lesser minds problem. In P.G. Bain, J. Vaes, & J.P. Leyens (Eds.), *Humanness and (de)humanization* (pp. 49-67). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Weick, K.E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Westwood, R.I., & Gavin, J. (2007). Manifesto for a post-colonial international business and management studies: A provocation. *Critical Perspectives on International Business, 3*(3), 246-265. https://doi.org/10.1108/17422040710775021

Williams, B. (2001). From freedom to liberty: The construction of a political value. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, *30*(1), 3-26. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1088-4963.2001.00003.x

Wood, M. (2007). Packaging liberty and marketing the gift of freedom: 1807 and the legacy of Clarkson's chest. *Parliamentary History*, *26*(1), 203-223. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-0206.2007.tb00686.x

Woods, M.E. (2015). A theory of moral outrage: Indignation and eighteenth-century British abolitionism. *Slavery & Abolition*, *36*(4), 662-683. https://doi.org/10.1080/0144039X.2014.963393

Zimbardo, P. (2011). *The Lucifer effect: How good people turn evil*. New York, NY: Random House.

Endnote

[i] Wilberforce's persuasive counterarguments to the 'sham of Negro inferiority' (Baker, 1970), which helped end slavery, was his lasting contribution to society. To commemorate him and the first centenary of the Abolitionist Act, in 1933 the University of Hull established a National Wilberforce Memorial Committee to fund an endowed Wilberforce Chair of History (Hayward, 1985). In 1983, a lecture series and conference on the intersection between freedom and slavery was established. "The intertwining of cultural and political themes, inseparable from the history of West Indian slavery and its contemporary legacies…was the leitmotif of the international conference" (Hayward, 1985, p.2). More recently, the University of Hull's Wilberforce Institute of Slavery and Emancipation helped to shape the U.K. government's Modern Slavery Act of 2015.

[ii] In contrast to de-marketing, which seeks to reduce product demand without maligning the product, counter-marketing treats the product as inherently harmful (Kotler, 1973; Kotler and Levy, 1971). British abolitionists meant to eliminate demand for slaves by impugning slavery, which is counter-marketing.